

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagawa et al. (US 6,265,034) in view of Sekine et al. (US 6,313,894).

Claim 18 is objected to for a minor informality.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claim 11 to further define the invention, amended claim 18, and added new claim 22. Accordingly, claims 11-18 and 22 are pending for further consideration.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 18 is objected to for a minor informality. Accordingly, Applicant has amend claim 18 in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagawa et al. (US 6,265,034) in view of Sekine et al. (US 6,313,894). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as being based upon a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claim 11, and hence dependent claims 12-18.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including a liquid crystal material layer "having an aligned photo-reactant material." In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Kagawa et al. nor Sekine et al.,

whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests a liquid crystal material layer “having an aligned photo-reactant material,” as recited by amended independent claim 11, and hence dependent claims 12-18. For example, although Kagawa et al. discloses a liquid crystal layer containing a photo-curable resin, Kagawa et al. is completely silent with respect to an alignment state of the photo-curable resin within the liquid crystal layer. Furthermore, Sekine et al. is completely silent with respect to a liquid crystal material layer having an aligned photo-reactant material.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Kawaga et al. and Sekin et al., whether taken individually or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 12-18

New Claim 22

Applicant has added new claim 22 to further define the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 22 is allowable at least because of its dependency from independent claim 11, and for the individual features that claims 22 recites.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: July 7, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000